



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,986	08/03/2001	Bruce A. Epstein	2386/102	6869
2101	7590	06/09/2006	EXAMINER	
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP 125 SUMMER STREET BOSTON, MA 02110-1618			TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/921,986	Applicant(s) EPSTEIN, BRUCE A.	
	Examiner Cam Y T. Truong	Art Unit 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/27/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has added new claims 23-43 and canceled claims 1-22 in the amendment filed on 2/21/2006.

Claims 23-43 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 23-25, 31, 35, 38, 39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (US 5867799).

As to claim 23, Suver teaches the claimed limitations:

"a computer system" as a computer system (fig. 1);

"a storage device, operably coupled to the computer system" as a database computer is operable coupled to the computer system (figs. 1&2, col. 7, lines 40-50),

“on which is maintained a collaborative database for recording data and related metadata providing details about the data and contributors of the data” as relational database for recording data and related attributes or files providing details about data and customers of data (col. 7, lines 45-67; col. 8, lines 1-27),

“the data including user-defined database structures including records and fields” as user-defined structures and collections of structures as a single column value. The system allows a user to create and define structures or groups of columns comprising sub-columns as a virtual sub-table, and store those structures as a single column value (col. 17, lines 35-67);

“at least one process executing on the computer system for collective management of the database by a plurality of users” as after receiving a user command 1204 e.g., a query or other database, control passes to routine 1400, where the command is interpreted. One of at least three possible general choices is possible: update the schema at step 1206, update or insert data with a routine 1500, or find and retrieve data with a routine 1700. Step 1206 carries out the task of updating the database schema (fig. 12, col. 20, lines 65-67; col. 21, lines 1-15). The system allows a plurality of users to access the database (col. 4, lines 5-20). The above information shows that step 1204 as one process executing on the computer system for receive management of the database by users for updating database or schema,

“the at least one process enabling users to modify database structures defined by other users and modify content of data records and fields contributed by other users” as after receiving a user command 1204 e.g., a query or other

Art Unit: 2162

database, control passes to routine 1400, where the command is interpreted.

One of at least three possible general choices is possible: update the schema at step 1206, update or insert data with a routine 1500, or find and retrieve data with a routine 1700. Step 1206 carries out the task of updating the database schema (fig. 12, col. 20, lines 65-67; col. 21, lines 1-15). The system allows a plurality of users to access the database (col. 4, lines 5-20). The above information shows that step 1204 as one process executing on the computer system for receive management of the database by users for updating database or schema. The system allows users to create and defined structures (col. 17, lines 35-40). The database schemas or structures are accessed and updated many users. It's obvious that users whom are accessed the databases, are not whom defined the database structures.

Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the metadata enables users to assess the reliability of the data and the contributors of the data".

Lang teaches the proposed informons of client profiles are presented to user U for review. User U reads and rates each selected A found in Z. The feedback from U can consist of a rating for how interesting U found A to b, as well as one or more of the following:

Opinion feedback: Did U agree, disagree, or have no opinion regarding the position of A?

Credibility Feedback: Did U find the facts, logic, sources, and quotes in A to be truthful and credible or not?

Art Unit: 2162

Informon Qualities: How does the user rate the informons qualities, for example, "interestingness," credibility, funniness, content value, writing quality, violence content, sexual content, profanity level, business importance, scientific merit, surprise/unexpectedness of information content, artistic quality, dramatic appeal, entertainment value, trendiness/importance to future directions, and opinion agreement. Specific Reason Feedback: Why did the user like or dislike A? Because of the authority?; Because of the source? Because A is out-of-date (e.g. weather report from 3 weeks ago)? Because the information contained in A has been seen already? (I.e., the problem of duplicate information delivery). Categorization Feedback: Did U liked A? Was it placed within the correct M and Z? Such multi-faceted feedback queries can produce rich feedback profiles from U that can be used to adapt each of the profiles used in the filtering process to some optimal operating point. When a user U evaluates the informons of a client, the user U evaluates the content information and client of the content information. Informons is represented as metadata. The client is represented as contributor (col. 19, lines 20-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lang's teaching of informons allows a user to evaluate credibility or reliability of the content information and client of content information to Gross's system in order to provide a system that allows a user to search/retrieve high quality data or credibility information via Internet

Art Unit: 2162

efficiently and further provide feedback's user for data of contributors so that contributors improve or increase trustworthiness of their data.

As to claim 24, Suver teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process permits database users to create new data fields for all records in the database" as (col. 4, lines 35-65).

As to claim 25, Suver teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process permits database users to delete existing data fields for all records of the database" as (col. 21, lines 60-67; col. 20, lines 20, lines 60-67).

As to claim 31, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process provides automated reliability assessment for assessing the reliability of the data and the database contributors".

Lang teaches the proposed informons of client profiles are presented to user U for review. User U reads and rates each selected A found in Z. The feedback from U can consist of a rating for how interesting U found A to b, as well as one or more of the following:

Opinion feedback: Did U agree, disagree, or have no opinion regarding the position of A?

Credibility Feedback: Did U find the facts, logic, sources, and quotes in A to be truthful and credible or not?

Informon Qualities: How does the user rate the informons qualities, for

Art Unit: 2162

example, "interestingness," credibility, funniness, content value, writing quality, violence content, sexual content, profanity level, business importance, scientific merit, surprise/unexpectedness of information content, artistic quality, dramatic appeal, entertainment value, trendiness/importance to future directions, and opinion agreement. Specific Reason Feedback: Why did the user like or dislike A? Because of the authority?; Because of the source? Because A is out-of-date (e.g. weather report from 3 weeks ago)? Because the information contained in A has been seen already? (I.e., the problem of duplicate information delivery). Categorization Feedback: Did U liked A? Was it placed within the correct M and Z? Such multi-faceted feedback queries can produce rich feedback profiles from U that can be used to adapt each of the profiles used in the filtering process to some optimal operating point. When a user U evaluates the informons of a client, the user U evaluates the content information and client of the content information. Informons is represented as metadata. The client is represented as contributor (col. 19, lines 20-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lang's teaching of informons allows a user to evaluate credibility or reliability of the content information and client of content information to Gross's system in order to provide a system that allows a user to search/retrieve high quality data or credibility information via Internet efficiently and further provide feedback's user for data of contributors so that contributors improve or increase trustworthiness of their data.



As to claim 35, Suver teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the computer system is operably coupled to a communication network, and wherein the at least one process provides a web interface through which the users interact with the database” as (col. 6, lines 40-50; col. 20, lines 55-65).

As to claim 38, Suver teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the at least one process permits database users to create a new database or database table” as (col. 17, lines 35-65).

As to claim 39, Suver teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the at least one process automatically stores metadata in the database including information regarding contributors of data and the data itself, such information provided explicitly by the contributor or obtained implicitly by the at least one process” as (fig. 2, col. 7, lines 40-67; col. 8, lines 1-15).

As to claim 43, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the at least one process automatically identifies and eliminates duplicate or redundant information”.

Lang teaches extraction means 17 can remove duplicate informons, even if the informons arrive from different sources, so that user resources are not wasted by handling and viewing repetitive and cumulative information. Extraction means 17 also can use at least part of a community profile and a user

Art Unit: 2162

profile for User #1 (5) to determine whether the informon content is relevant to the community of which User #1 is a part (col. 13, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lang's teaching of remove duplicate informons to Suver's system in order to save time for user to review repetitive and cumulative information.

5. Claims 26-28, 34 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (US 5867799) and further in view Gross.

As to claim 26, Suver teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process includes privilege mechanisms, notification mechanisms, history mechanisms allowing for orderly changes to database structures and content without a central administrator".

Gross teaches the tracking module 200 tracks and updates history database 215 (page 6, col. Right, lines 30-48). A vendor id is represented as a user identification information (fig. 3D).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gross's teaching to Suver's system in order to collect user's activity on the database so that a user can update records in the database following sequence of time without conflicting.

Art Unit: 2162

As to claim 27, Suver and Lang disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 26, Lang further teach the claimed limitation "wherein the reliability of the data is assessed by evaluating the reliability of its contributors and the reliability of the contributors is assessed by evaluating the reliability of the data" as the proposed informons of client profiles are presented to user U for review. User U reads and rates each selected A found in Z. The feedback from U can consist of a rating for how interesting U found A to b, as well as one or more of the following:

Opinion feedback: Did U agree, disagree, or have no opinion regarding the position of A?

Credibility Feedback: Did U find the facts, logic, sources, and quotes in A to be truthful and credible or not?

Informon Qualities: How does the user rate the informons qualities, for example, "interestingness," credibility, funniness, content value, writing quality, violence content, sexual content, profanity level, business importance, scientific merit, surprise/unexpectedness of information content, artistic quality, dramatic appeal, entertainment value, trendiness/importance to future directions, and opinion agreement. Specific Reason Feedback: Why did the user like or dislike A? Because of the authority?; Because of the source? Because A is out-of-date (e.g. weather report from 3 weeks ago)? Because the information contained in A has been seen already? (I.e., the problem of duplicate information delivery). Categorization Feedback: Did U liked A? Was it placed within the correct M and Z? Such multi-faceted

Art Unit: 2162

feedback queries can produce rich feedback profiles from U that can be used to adapt each of the profiles used in the filtering process to some optimal operating point. When a user U evaluates the informons of a client, the user U evaluates the content information and client of the content information. Informons is represented as metadata. The client is represented as contributor (col. 19, lines 20-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lang's teaching of informons allows a user to evaluate credibility or reliability of the content information and client of content information to Suver's system in order to provide a system that allows a user to search/retrieve high quality data or credibility information via Internet efficiently and further provide feedback's user for data of contributors so that contributors improve or increase trustworthiness of their data.

As to claim 28, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process provides automated versioning for tracking and maintaining a history of each datum recorded in the database".

Gross teaches the tracking module 200 tracks and updates history database 215 (page 6, col. Right, lines 30-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gross's teaching of the tracking module 200 tracks and updates history database 215 to Suver's system in order to collect user's activity on the database so that a user can update records in the

Art Unit: 2162

database following sequence of time without conflicting and further to protect data records from modification without permission.

As to claim 34, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “the data tracked for a contributor’s contributions or deletions comprise at least one of user identification information; user personal information; user performance information; information characterization information; contributor information; feedback information; implicit information; historical information; user rankings obtained from one or more ranking authorities; option information from contributors and users of the data regarding the reliability of the data and the users”.

Gross teaches a vendor id is represented as a user identification information (fig. 3D).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gross’s teaching of a vendor id is represented as a user identification information to Suver’s system in order to protect data records from modification without permission.

As to claim 37, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the history includes the original data and metadata identifying details about the modified data and its contributor”.

Gross teaches the tracking module 200 tracks and updates history database 215 (page 6, col. Right, lines 30-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gross's teaching of the tracking module 200 tracks and updates history database 215 to Suver's system in order to collect user's activity on the database so that a user can update records in the database following sequence of time without conflicting.

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (US 5867799) and further in view Gross and Robertson.

As to claim 29, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process provides automated notification to interested database users regarding changes to database structure or contents".

Robertson teaches whenever a second user updates any information in any data field of his/her profile, the information in that field is automatically notified or maintained in the first users' profiles whom they has permission to view the information for ensuring that they have the most up to date contact information (see col. 3, lines 12-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user updates any information in any data field of his/her profile, the information in that field is automatically notified or maintained in the first users' profiles whom they has permission to view the information to the Gross's system and Lang's system in order to allow a user to save time for monitoring updated

Art Unit: 2162

data fields or interests of other users and further to provide a system whereby users can participate in discussion groups with others interested in same topic.

7. Claim 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (US 5867799) and further in view of Khemlani et al (or hereinafter "Khemlani") (US 6772164).

As to claim 30, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process automatically obtains information from various sources and automatically integrates the information into the database".

Khemlani teaches a customization database 115 is also coupled to the processor 110. The customization database 115 stores records containing pre-selected parameters (Custom Records) that are used to select and retrieve information from the information sources 105 as is further described below (abstract, fig. 2A, col. 3, lines 15-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Khemlani's teaching to Suver's system in order to custominze information from different sources easily before displaying information to a user for viewing.

As to claim 33, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process provides automated and customizable data retrieval based on criteria provided by the users". Khemlani teaches a

Art Unit: 2162

customization database 115 is also coupled to the processor 110. The customization database 115 stores records containing pre-selected parameters (Custom Records) that are used to select and retrieve information from the information sources 105 as is further described below (abstract, fig. 2A, col. 3, lines 15-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Khemlani's teaching to Suver's system in order to to allow a user to customize format of a document following user's desire so that the user can view different features of a document.

8. Claim 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (US 5867799) and further in view of Odero et al (or hereinafter "Odero") (US 2002/007063).

As to claim 30, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process automatically obtains information from various sources and automatically integrates the information into the database".

Odero teaches custom Internet portals to display web-centric information exist (e.g., myYahoo, myLycos etc.). These portals aggregate information from different HTML sources into one interface where it can be accessed through one interface (paragraph [0004]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Odero's teaching to Suver's system in



Art Unit: 2162

order to customize information from different sources easily before displaying information to a user for viewing.

As to claim 33, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the at least one process provides automated and customizable data retrieval based on criteria provided by the users”.

Odero an interface that displays the user customized information, (b) an interface that allows the user to select and manage the information of choice, (c) a mechanism for marking selected information contained in a web-page (d) a method for communicating that information to the backend servers that process and store that information, (e) a mechanism for the storage of the selected information (f) a mechanism for regularly retrieving selected information and (g) a mechanism for checking for change in the content or the format of the selected sources of information (paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Odero’s teaching to Suver’s system in order to allow a user to customize format of a document following user’s desire so that the user can view different features of a document.

9. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter “Lang”) (US 5867799) and further in view of Fratkina (US 2005/0055321).

Art Unit: 2162

As to claim 32, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the at least one process provides automated help for resolving user questions”.

Fratkina teaches if resolving the goal requires asking the user follow-up questions, what type(s) and format(s) of follow-up questions the dialog engine should generate and return to the user (paragraph [0215]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Fratkina’s teaching of if resolving the goal requires asking the user follow-up questions, what type(s) and format(s) of follow-up questions the dialog engine should generate and return to the user to Suver’s system in order to help a user save time searching any information on the internet.

10. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver (US 6016497) in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter “Lang”) (US 5867799) and further in view of Gross and Robertson.

As to claim 36, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the at least one process... from another database”.

Gross teaches the claimed limitations:

“wherein the metabase uses an editable data markup language for creating and using the metabase, wherein the editable data markup language comprises: means for defining metabase structures” as the web documents are

Art Unit: 2162

encoded using HTML. The system create vendor/product database which store information about products and services directly (page 4, col. Right, lines 49-67; page 3, col. Left, lines 50-60);

“means for editing metabase structures” as updating database (page 4, col. Left, lines 23-30);

“means for contributing information to metabase structures” as database 200 contains products and attributes of products (page 7, col. Right, lines 50-55, fig. 3J);

“means for retrieving information from the metabase structures” retrieving products from database 200 (figs. 4-5);

“means for combining data from multiple metabases” as receiving all information from vendors and storing in database 200 (page 4, lines 20-60).

Gross does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “means for automatically updating one metabase from another metabase”. Robertson teaches whenever a second user updates any information in any data field of his/her profile, the information in that field is automatically notified or maintained in the first users' profiles whom they has permission to view the information for ensuring that they have the most up to date contact information (see col. 3, lines 12-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gross's teaching and Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user updates any information in any data field of his/her profile, the information in that field is automatically notified or maintained

Art Unit: 2162

in the first users' profiles whom they has permission to view the information to the Suver's system in order to allow a user to save time for monitoring updated data fields or interests of other users and further to provide a system whereby users can participate in discussion groups with others interested in same topic.

11. Claims 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (USP 5765138) and further in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang420") (USP 6314420).

As to claim 40, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process provides a ranking authority for generating user rankings based upon user contributions to the database".

Lang teaches the proposed informons of client profiles are presented to user U for review. User U reads and rates each selected A found in Z. The feedback from U can consist of a rating for how interesting U found A to b, as well as one or more of the following:

Opinion feedback: Did U agree, disagree, or have no opinion regarding the position of A?

Credibility Feedback: Did U find the facts, logic, sources, and quotes in A to be truthful and credible or not?

Informon Qualities: How does the user rate the informons qualities, for example, "interestingness," credibility, funniness, content value, writing quality, violence content, sexual content, profanity level, business importance, scientific merit, surprise/unexpectedness of information content,

Art Unit: 2162

artistic quality, dramatic appeal, entertainment value, trendiness/importance to future directions, and opinion agreement. Specific Reason Feedback: Why did the user like or dislike A? Because of the authority?; Because of the source? Because A is out-of-date (e.g. weather report from 3 weeks ago)? Because the information contained in A has been seen already? (I.e., the problem of duplicate information delivery). Categorization Feedback: Did U liked A? Was it placed within the correct M and Z? Such multi-faceted feedback queries can produce rich feedback profiles from U that can be used to adapt each of the profiles used in the filtering process to some optimal operating point. When a user U evaluates the informons of a client, the user U evaluates the content information and client of the content information. Informons is represented as metadata. The client is represented as contributor (col. 19, lines 20-50). Lang420 teaches users can sort documents which they have read from best to worst (col. 24, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lang420' s teaching of users can sort documents to Gross and Lang in order to indicate how good quality of a document or a product.

As to claim 41, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the ranking authority evaluates the reliability of the contributors based upon metadata relating to the contributor's contributions to the database according to criteria provided by a user".

Art Unit: 2162

Lang teaches Lang teaches the proposed informons of client profiles are presented to user U for review. User U reads and rates each selected A found in Z. The feedback from U can consist of a rating for how interesting U found A to b, as well as one or more of the following:

Opinion feedback: Did U agree, disagree, or have no opinion regarding the position of A?

Credibility Feedback: Did U find the facts, logic, sources, and quotes in A to be truthful and credible or not?

Informon Qualities: How does the user rate the informons qualities, for example, "interestingness," credibility, funniness, content value, writing quality, violence content, sexual content, profanity level, business importance, scientific merit, surprise/unexpectedness of information content, artistic quality, dramatic appeal, entertainment value, trendiness/importance to future directions, and opinion agreement. Specific Reason Feedback: Why did the user like or dislike A? Because of the authority?; Because of the source? Because A is out-of-date (e.g. weather report from 3 weeks ago)? Because the information contained in A has been seen already? (I.e., the problem of duplicate information delivery). Categorization Feedback: Did U liked A? Was it placed within the correct M and Z? Such multi-faceted feedback queries can produce rich feedback profiles from U that can be used to adapt each of the profiles used in the filtering process to some optimal operating point. When a user U evaluates the informons of a client, the user U evaluates the content information and client of the content information. Informons is

Art Unit: 2162

represented as metadata. The client is represented as contributor (col. 19, lines 20-50). Lang420 teaches users can sort documents which they have read from best to worst (col. 24, lines 50-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lang420's teaching of users can sort documents to Gross and Lang in order to indicate how good quality of a document or a product.

12. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suver in view of Lang et al (or hereinafter "Lang") (USP 5765138) and further in view of Herz (US 5835087).

As to claim 42, Suver does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the at least one process automatically solicits feedback and missing information from the users".

Herz teaches the system solicits relevance feedback from user (col. 19, lines 45-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Herz's teaching of the system solicits relevance feedback from user to Suver's system in order to make users to satisfy with service of web sites on the Internet system.

***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2162

***Contact Information***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cam-Y Truong  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
5/15/2006